

REMARKS

Claims 2, 5-9, 11, 13-16, 18, 19, 21, 24-28, 30, 32-34, 37-43, 45, 46 and 54-59 are pending in the application.

Claims 2, 5-9, 11, 13-16, 18, 19, 21, 24-28, 30, 32-34, 37-43, 45, 46 and 54-59 have been rejected.

Claims 2, 15, 21, and 34 have been amended. Support for these amendments is found at pages 9 and 17 of the Specification. No new matter is added.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 2, 5-9, 11, 13-16, 18-19, 21, 24-28, 30, 32-34, 37-43, 45-46 and 54-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The Office Action states that the Specification fails to provide support for the following feature: “said corresponding channel driver is implemented apart from said configurable communication server.” Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that this passage is supported, at least, by page 8 of the Specification (which discloses a third party vendor providing a channel driver to the communication server using an application program interface (API)) as well as FIG. 1A. As shown in FIG. 1A, the communication server (e.g., communication server 109) and API (e.g., communication API 125) are separate components. FIG. 1A also shows a channel driver (e.g., channel driver 120A) implemented apart from the communication server. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Specification supports the claimed “said corresponding channel driver is implemented apart from said configurable communication server.”

The Office Action also states that the Specification fails to support “communicating is agnostic of a media type.” Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is moot in light of amendments to the claims presented herein.

Claims 2, 5-9, 11, 13-16, 18-19, 21, 24-28, 30, 32-34, 37-43, 45-46 and 54-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is moot in light of amendments to the claims presented herein.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2, 5-9, 11, 13-16, 18-19, 21, 24-28, 30, 32-34, 37-43, 45-46 and 54-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,092,509 issued to Mears, et al. ("Mears") in view of Official Notice taken with respect to U.S. Patent No. 7,047,534 issued to Sadovsky, et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,974,474 issued to Furner, et al. "Official Notice." Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose communicating with a media-specific communication channel wherein the communicating is independent of the media type of the communication channel, as claimed. The Office Action cites the following portion of Mears as purportedly disclosing this feature:

As also exemplified in detail below, the software and related hardware of the contact center system 100 provide multimedia blending in a contact center. Specifically, the software and related hardware provide unified queuing of all media types, such as e-mail, telephony, web chat, and web call back into a single unified queue. The software and associated hardware also provide skills-based and priority-based routing of these contacts to agents within the contact center.

Mears 10:14-22 (cited at Office Action, p. 5). Applicants are unable to discern any portion of the above passage that could possibly be characterized as communicating in a manner that is independent of a media type of a communication channel. If anything, the above passage discloses just the opposite. That is, the above passage discloses that

Mears' contact center provides software that blends all the media types with which Mears' system is capable of communicating. Mears' software is, by definition, aware of (dependent upon) the types of media being handled. Otherwise, such software would be pointless. That is, if no difference between media types was recognized, no special software would be required to blend the media types. Since differences between media types are explicitly recognized by Mears' software, the software is not (and, in fact, cannot be) independent of media type. Thus, the cited passage does not disclose communicating independent of the media type of a communication channel, as claimed.

Applicants further respectfully submit that the cited references also fail to disclose determining an event response in response to an event, as claimed. The Office Action cites Mears 10:24-11:5 as purportedly disclosing these features. Office Action, p. 6. However, the cited portions of Mears fail to disclose any actions performed "in response to an event," as claimed. Instead, the cited portions of Mears disclose administrative tasks, such as configuring Mears' call center system. These administrative tasks are presumably performed prior to receiving an event, so could not be performed in response to receiving an event. Furthermore, even if the performance of Mears' disclosed configuration actions could somehow be characterized as being done in response to an event (which Applicants maintain is not the case), the cited portions of Mears fail to disclose determining an event response, wherein the determining comprises "querying a customer support center database, and identifying a channel driver that corresponds to the incoming communication channel," as claimed. Therefore, the cited references fail to disclose each element of claim 2, as amended.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claim 2, and all claims depending from claim 2, and an indication of the allowability of same. Applicants further request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an indication of allowability for claims 15, 21, and 34, and all claims depending therefrom, as these claims are rejected for similar reasons as claim 2 and the remarks made with respect to claim 2 apply with equal force to these claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (512) 439-5092.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shawn Doman/

Shawn Doman
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 60,362
Telephone: (512) 439-5092
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099